

generated by the energy and enthusiasm when women get into a competitive mood.

But we have a long way to go, Mr. Speaker. In fact, we need more women CEOs. We need to address the question of pay equity, more engineers and scientists. Yet, Mr. Speaker, we have yet to elect the first woman president of the United States of America.

So I am grateful to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) and former Congresswoman Green, as authors of this energetic legislation. They dreamed and we believed and we accomplished. Today we honor them for their work, and our commitment and challenge, Mr. Speaker, is that we go forth to do better, to do great things, and to create equality for men and women in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the Women's Caucus in honor of title IX, the landmark legislation that bans gender discrimination in school academics and athletics. I also wish to applaud the authors of this legislation, Representative Patsy Mink and former Congresswoman Edith Green. Their leadership ushered in a new era of appreciation for women in sports and in academia.

I also stand to congratulate the Women's World Cup Team champions. Their historic win a few weeks ago over China was watched all over the world and certainly serves as a testament to the importance of title IX.

Finally, I would like to offer words of congratulations to Air Force Colonel Eileen Collins, the first woman to pilot the Space Shuttle.

Each of these accomplishments serve to remind us that only 27 years ago, there was no title IX and women were still second class citizens. We have come a long way from the days when only men were expected to be legislators, excel in sports and fly into space. This is truly a great day for women in America and all over the world. It is vital that we do not pit the value of women's sports against the needs of men's collegiate sports.

Since title IX passed, we have seen that there have been significant increases in women's educational achievements. In 1994, women received 38 percent of medical degrees, 43 percent of the law degrees, and 44 percent of all doctoral degrees. In 1972, the numbers for professional degrees were in the single digits (9 percent for medicine and 7 percent for law).

In athletics, we have also seen more opportunities for women in intercollegiate sports. Institutions now must ensure that there is adequate athletic financial assistance, accommodation of athletic interests and abilities of women, and that the opportunities and treatments afforded to sports participants must be equivalent.

Some other program components include providing access to equipment and supplies, opportunity to receive academic tutoring, medical and training facilities and services, adequate support services and publicity. These benefits are some of the ways institutions ensure that sport participants receive equivalent treatment.

We know that title IX has had an important impact on women's sports. We have seen the success of the Women's National Basketball Association and the Women's Soccer Team

as evidence that access to these programs in college is crucial to professional development.

I am proud to stand here today to applaud this important legislation and these women who have blazed the trail of achievement for other women. These athletes will inspire a new generation of girls to engage in sports. CEOs, pay equity, and, yes, we have yet to elect this Nation's first women President.

I am grateful to serve in Congress with Representative PATSY MINK, one of the authors of this legislation. She must have only dreamed that we would be here today in honor of the great accomplishments of women due to her work. Today, we honor your work and the work of other women who have fought hard to give more opportunities to women.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. SLAUGHTER addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. BROWN of Florida addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BLUMENAUER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. NAPOLITANO addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MCKINNEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

## TAX RELIEF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. DICKEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, the discussion about tax relief has been brought to this body tonight in very eloquent terms. What I would like to do is to talk to one of my colleagues, one in particular, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI), who is headed this way, to discuss the practical side of tax relief.

As I go about my district, and I have seen the discussions brought about, both the pros and cons, I am perplexed by the fact that people are saying we do not need tax relief.

I want to state at the front of this that there are three reasons that I can see for tax relief that is needed at any time, and especially at this time.

One is to support the economy. We have surpluses now that have never been so great. They were not obvious in that the projections 5 years ago, even 3 years ago, were that we were going to have deficits, a continuation of deficits. But we have surpluses now.

The economy is growing from a lot of different sources. There is a lot of money in the stock market. It is over 11,000 now, which is unheard of. When I came in 1992, I think it was right below 3,000. So it is a factor that we need to support the economy so that it does not go down, so that we can keep the surpluses. Tax relief is one way of doing that.

Secondly, we must shrink the government. We are doing a good job. It is not simple. We are doing it over a lot of objections. We are doing it through elections after elections, when people are saying, from the other side, you do not care about this, you are mean-spirited, you are this or that. But we have started bringing the cost of government down.

There is one sure way we can do that. That is to stop the blood supply or stop the money from coming in. Tax relief will provide that, and it will also help and give freedom to the people who work.

We have too many people who were finding their families in disarray. They are not spending enough time at the breakfast table, the dinner table, the supper table. That is because they are having to work two jobs. They keep talking about let us bring costs down, but our inflation is under control.

We have a lot of different factors that are being mentioned, but the big problem is that we are just taxing people to death.

This particular tax relief package includes something called estate taxes. That is something that I hope, when the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI) gets here that we can talk about in more detail. But we have to support the economy, keep the surpluses in place, shrink the government,